

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to air an
anti-Kerry
documentary shortly
before the election
is a blatant
example of the
dangers of media
consolidation.

Because Sinclair
pays nothing for the
privilege of using
the public airwaves,
it is obligated by
law to serve the
public interest.
Without allowing
equal time for
airing either a
rebuttal, an
anti-Bush program or
a pro-Kerry program
to balance the
airing of the
anti-Kerry program,
the public is not
being served. When
large companies
control the
airwaves, we get
more of what's good
for the bottom line
and less of what is
for the good of the
general public.

Sinclair's decision
show why we need to
strengthen rules
against media
consolidation, not
weaken them. Their
decision shows why
the license renewal
process needs to
involve a fair and
thorough review.
Thank you.
Cristine Barsanti